Degrees of Freedom of the Symmetric Multi-Relay MIMO Y Channel

Tian Ding, Xiaojun Yuan, *Member, IEEE,* and Soung Chang Liew, *Fellow, IEEE*

arXiv:1511.08887v1 [cs.IT] 28 Nov 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we study the degrees of freedom (DoF) of a new network information flow model called symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, where three user nodes, each with M antennas, communicate via K geographically separated relay nodes, each with N antennas. For this model, we establish a general DoF achievability framework based on linear precoding and post-processing methods. The framework poses a nonlinear problem with respect to user precoders and post-processors, as well as relay precoders. To solve this problem, we adopt an *uplink-dowlink asymmetric* strategy, where the user precoders are designed for signal alignment and the user post-processors are used for interference neutralization. With the user precoder and post-processor designs fixed as such, the original problem then reduces to a problem of relay precoder design. To address the solvability of the system, we propose a general method for solving matrix equations. This method is also useful to the DoF analysis of many other multiway relay networks. Together with the techniques of antenna disablement and symbol extension, an achievable DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel is derived for an arbitrary setup of (K, M, N). We show that, for $K \geq 2$, the optimal DoF is achieved for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, 1\right\}\right) \cup \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right)$. We also show that for symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, our design outperforms the conventional uplink-downlink symmetric design considerably.

Index Terms

Multiway relay channel, network coding, signal alignment, partial antenna disablement, symbol extension

I. Introduction

Wireless relaying, as a promising technique to extend the coverage and increase the system capacity, have attracted much research interest in recent years [1], [2]. Physical-layer network coding (PNC) [3] is an advanced relaying technique that significantly enhances spectral efficiency by allowing a relay node to decode and forward message combinations rather than individual messages. PNC was first proposed as a two-way relaying mechanism, where two users exchange information via a relay node. Later, the idea of PNC was extended to support efficient communications over multiway relay channels (mRC) [4], where multiple users exchange data with the help of a single relay. Efficient PNC design has been studied for various data exchange models, including pairwise data

exchange [5], [6], full data exchange [5], [7], and clustered pairwise/full data exchange [5], [8]–[10]. Multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) techniques have also been incorporated into PNC-aided relay networks to achieve spatial multiplexing [11].

The capacity of general MIMO mRC remains a challenging open problem [12], [13]. Existing work [14]–[19] was mostly focused on analyzing the degrees of freedom (DoF) that characterizes the capacity slope at high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Various signaling techniques have been developed to intelligently manipulate signals and interference based on the ideas of PNC and interference alignment [20]. Particularly, the authors in [17]–[19] studied the DoF of the MIMO Y channel, where three users exchange data in a pairwise manner with the help of a single relay. To derive the DoF of this model, a key difficulty is how to jointly optimize the linear processors, including the precoders at the user transmitters, the precoder at the relay, and the post-processers at user receivers. This problem was elegantly solved in [18] by optimal design of the signal space seen at the relay, where the user precoders and post-processors are constructed by *pairwise signal alignment* and *uplink-downlink symmetry*, and the relay precoder by appropriate orthogonal projections. Similar ideas have also been used to derive the DoF of other multiway relay models [8], [12].

In the work on MIMO mRC mentioned above, a major limitation is that a single relay node is employed to serve multiple user nodes simultaneously. This implies that the relay node is usually the performance bottleneck of the overall network [8], [10]. As such, some recent work began to explore the potential of deploying more relay nodes for enhancing the network capacity. For instance, the authors in [21] derived an achievable DoF of the two-relay MIMO mRC in which two pairs of users exchange messages in a pairwise manner via two relays. Later, the work in [22] improved the DoF result in [21] by using the techniques of pairwise signal alignment and uplink-downlink symmetric design. The extension to the case of more than two user pairs was also considered in [22]. However, the DoF characterization of the multi-relay MIMO mRC is still at a very initial stage. On one hand, the achievability proof of [22] relies on some recent progresses on the solvability of linear matrix systems, and is difficult to be extended for other multi-relay mRC models, especially those with more than two relay nodes. On the other hand, for a multi-relay mRC, as the received signals at geographically separated relays cannot be jointly processed, manipulating the relay signal space is far more difficult than the single-relay case. Also, there is no guarantee that the optimal single-relay techniques, such as pairwise signal alignment and uplink-downlink symmetric design, are still optimal for a multi-relay mRC.

In this paper, we analyze the DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, where three user nodes, each with M antennas, communicate with each other via K relay nodes, each with N antennas. Compared with the MIMO Y channel in [17], a critical difference is that our new model contains an arbitrary number of relays, rather than only a single relay. Following [22], we formulate a general DoF achievability problem for the multi-relay

MIMO Y channel based on linear processing techniques, involving the design of user precoders, relay precoders, and user post-processors. The main contributions of this paper are as follows.

- In contrast to the conventional uplink-downlink symmetric design, we propose a new uplink-downlink asymmetric approach to solve the DoF achievability problem. Specifically, in the proposed approach, only user precoders are designed based on signal space alignment; the user post-processors are designed for interference neutralization. Furthermore, the uplink-downlink asymmetry also allows the relays to deactivate a certain number of receiving (not transmitting) antennas to facilitate the signal space alignment at relays.
- Given the designed user precoders and post-processors, the original problem boils down to a linear system on the relay precoders with certain rank constraints. To tackle the solvability of this system, we establish a novel method to solve linear matrix equations with rank constraints. We emphasize that this method can generally be used to analyze the DoF of other multi-relay mRCs with various data exchange models.
- Based on the above new techniques, we derive an achievable DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel with an arbitrary configuration of (M, N, K). Our DoF result significantly outperforms the DoF of the single-relay MIMO Y channel, implying that introducing multiple relays greatly enhances the relaying capability of the network. Also, our achievable DoF is considerably higher than the achievable DoF with the uplink-downlink symmetric approach in [22]. Furthermore, we establish the optimality of the derived DoF for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, 1\right\}\right) \cup \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right)$ (with $K \geq 2$).

Notation: We use bold upper and lower case letters for matrices and column vectors, respectively. $\mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$ denotes the $m \times n$ dimensional complex space. $\mathbf{0}_{m\times n}$ and $\mathbf{I}_n$ represent the $m \times n$ zero matrix and the n-dimensional identity matrix, respectively. For any matrix $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the vectorization of $\mathbf{A}$ formed by stacking the columns of $\mathbf{A}$ into a single column vector. Moreover, $\otimes$ represents the Kronecker product operation.

II. System Model

A. Channel Model

Consider a symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel as shown in Fig. 1, where three user nodes, each equipped with M antennas, exchange information with the help of K relay nodes, each with N antennas. Pairwise data exchange is employed, i.e., every user delivers two independent messages, one to each of the other two users. We assume that the information delivering is half-duplex, i.e., nodes in the network cannot transmit and receive signals simultaneously in a single frequency band. Every round of data exchange consists of two phases, namely, the uplink phase and the downlink phase. The two phases have equal duration T, where T is an integer representing the number of symbols within each phase interval.

In the uplink phase, the users transmit signals to the relays simultaneously. The received signal at each relay is



Fig. 1. The system model of a symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel. The communication protocol consists of two phases: uplink phase and downlink phase.

written as

$$\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{R},k} = \sum_{j=0}^{2} \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{X}_j + \mathbf{Z}_{\mathrm{R},k}, \quad k = 0, 2, \cdots, K-1 \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{k,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times M}$ denotes the channel matrix from user j to relay k; $\mathbf{X}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times T}$ is the transmitted signal of user j; $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{R},k} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times T}$ is the received signal at relay k; $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathrm{R},k} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times T}$ is the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) matrix at relay k, with the elements independently drawn from $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2_{\mathrm{R},k})$. Note that $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{R},k}$ is the noise power at relay k. The power constraint for user j is $\frac{1}{T}\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{X}_j\mathbf{X}_j^H) \leq P_j$, where P_j is the maximum transmission power allowed at user j.

In the downlink phase, the relays broadcast signals to the users. The received signal at each user is represented as

$$\mathbf{Y}_j = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{R},k} + \mathbf{Z}_j, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{j,k} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times N}$ is the channel matrix from relay k to user j; $\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{R},k} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times T}$ is the transmitted signal from relay k; $\mathbf{Y}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times T}$ is the received signal at user j; $\mathbf{Z}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times T}$ is the AWGN matrix at user j, with elements independently drawn from $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_j^2)$. Here, σ_j^2 is the noise power at user j. The power constraint of relay k is given by $\frac{1}{T}\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{R},k}\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{R},k}^H\right) \leq P_{\mathrm{R},k}$, where $P_{\mathrm{R},k}$ is the power budget of relay k.

The elements of channel matrices $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ are drawn from a continuous distribution, implying that the channel matrices are of full column or row rank, whichever is smaller, with probability one. We assume that channel state information (CSI) is globally known at every node in the model, following the convention in [5], [11], [12]. Moreover, for notational convenience, we interpret the user index by modulo 3 so that, e.g., user 3 is the same as user 0.

B. Degrees of Freedom

The goal of this paper is to analyze the degrees of freedom of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel described above. For convenience of discussion, we assume symmetric power constraints, i.e., $P_0 = P_1 = P_2 = P$ and $P_{\mathrm{R},0} = P_{\mathrm{R},1} = \cdots = P_{\mathrm{R},K-1} = P_{\mathrm{R}}$. Let $m_{j,j'} \in \{1, 2, \cdots, 2^{R_{j',j}T}\}$ be the message from user j to j', where $R_{j,j'}$ is the corresponding information rate, for $j, j' = 0, 1, 2$ and $j \neq j'$. Note that $R_{j,j'}$ is in general a function of power P and P_{R}, denoted by $R_{j,j'}(P, P_{\mathrm{R}})$. An information rate $R_{j,j'}(P, P_{\mathrm{R}})$ is said to be achievable if the error probability of decoding message $m_{j,j'}$ at receiver j' approaches zero as $T \to \infty$. An achievable DoF of user j to user j' is defined as

$$d_{j,j'} = \lim_{\substack{P\to\infty \\ P_{\mathrm{R}}\to\infty}} \frac{R_{j,j'}(P, P_{\mathrm{R}})}{\log\left(\min\{P, P_{\mathrm{R}}\}\right)}. \tag{3}$$

Intuitively, $d_{j,j'}$ can be interpreted as the number of independent spatial data streams that user j can reliably transmit to user j'. Then the total achievable DoF is given by

$$d_{\mathrm{sum}} = \sum_{\substack{0\leq j,j'\leq 2 \\ j\neq j'}} d_{j,j'}. \tag{4}$$

The optimal total DoF of the considered model is defined as the superemum of d_{sum}. In this paper, we assume a symmetric DoF setting with $d_{0,1} = d_{0,2} = d_{1,0} = d_{1,2} = d_{2,0} = d_{2,1} = d$. Then the total DoF can be represented as $d_{\mathrm{sum}} = 6d$.

We now present a DoF upper bound by assuming full cooperation among the relays. Under this assumption, the system model in (1) and (2) reduces to a single-relay MIMO Y channel, with KN antennas at the relay. Therefore, the DoF capacity of such a single-relay MIMO Y channel naturally serves as a DoF upper bound of the model considered in (1) and (2). From [18], this upper bound is given by

$$d_{\mathrm{sum}} \leq \min\left\{3M, 2KN\right\}, \tag{5a}$$

or equivalently

$$d \leq \min\left\{\frac{M}{2}, \frac{KN}{3}\right\}. \tag{5b}$$

C. Linear Processing

In this paper, an achievable DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel is derived by linear processing techniques. The message $m_{j,j'}$, $j' \neq j$, is encoded into $\mathbf{S}_{j,j'} \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times T}$, with d independent spatial streams in T channel uses. The transmitted signal of user j is given by

$$\mathbf{X}_j = \sum_{\substack{j'=0 \\ j'\neq j}}^{2} \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\mathbf{S}_{j,j'}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathbf{U}_{j,j'} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times d}$ is the linear precoding matrix for $\mathbf{S}_{j,j'}$. For each relay, the transmitted signal is represented by

$$\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{R},k} = \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{R},k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \cdots, K-1, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathbf{F}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ is the precoding matrix of relay k.

With (1), (6) and (7), we can express the received signal of user j in (2) as

$$\mathbf{Y}_j = \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\sum_{\substack{j'=0\\ j'\neq j}}^{2} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,j'}\mathbf{U}_{j',j}\mathbf{S}_{j',j}}_{\text{desired signal}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\sum_{\substack{j'=0\\ j'\neq j}}^{2} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\mathbf{S}_{j,j'}}_{\text{self-interference}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\sum_{\substack{j'\neq j''\\ j',j''\neq j}} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,j'}\mathbf{U}_{j',j''}\mathbf{S}_{j',j''}}_{\text{other interference}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{Z}_{\mathrm{R},k} + \mathbf{Z}_j}_{\text{noise}}. \tag{8}$$

In the above, $\mathbf{Y}_j$ consists of four signal components: the desired signal, the self interference, the other interference and the noise. Since user j perfectly knows the CSI and the self message $\{\mathbf{S}_{j,j'}, \forall j' \neq j\}$, the self-interference term in (8) can be pre-cancelled before further processing. Each user j is required to decode $2d$ spatial streams, d from each of the other two users. To this end, there must be an interference-free subspace with dimension $2d$ in the receiving signal space of user j. More specifically, denote by $\mathbf{V}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2d\times M}$ a projection matrix, with $\mathbf{V}_j\mathbf{Y}_j$ being the projected image of $\mathbf{Y}_j$ in the subspace spanned by the row space of $\mathbf{V}_j$. Then, to ensure the decodability of $\mathbf{S}_{j',j}$, $j' \neq j$, at user j, we should appropriately design $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$, $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ to satisfy two sets of requirements, as detailed below.

On one hand, $\mathbf{V}_j\mathbf{Y}_j$ should be interference free. That is, the following interference neutralization requirement should be met:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_0\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{9a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_0\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1} = \mathbf{0} \tag{9b}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_1\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0} = \mathbf{0} \tag{9c}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_1\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{9d}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_2\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1} = \mathbf{0} \tag{9e}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_2\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{9f}$$

On the other hand, user j needs to decode $2d$ spatial streams from the projected signal $\mathbf{V}_j\mathbf{Y}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2d\times T}$. To ensure the decodability, the desired signal in (8) after projection should be of rank $2d$. Define

$$\mathbf{W}_{k,0} = [\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}]$$

$$\mathbf{W}_{k,1} = [\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}, \mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1}]$$

$$\mathbf{W}_{k,2} = [\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}]\,.$$

Then the effective channel for the messages desired by user j can be expressed as $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{V}_j\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{W}_{k,j}$. To ensure the decodability of $2d$ spatial streams at each user j, we have the following rank requirements:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{V}_0\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{W}_{k,0}\right) = 2d \tag{9g}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{V}_1\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{W}_{k,1}\right) = 2d \tag{9h}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K=1}\mathbf{V}_2\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{W}_{k,2}\right) = 2d. \tag{9i}$$

Given an antenna setup (M, N) and a target DoF d, if there exist suitable matrices $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{V}_j\}$ satisfying (9) with probability one for random $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$, then a total DoF $d_{\text{sum}} = 6d$ is achieved by the proposed linear processing scheme. Thus, the key issue is to analyze the solvability of the system (9) with respect to $\{\mathbf{U}_{j',j}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{V}_j\}$, which is the main focus of the rest of this paper.

III. Achievable DoF of the Symmetric Multi-Relay MIMO Y Channel

In general, to check the achievability of a certain DoF d, we need to jointly design $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{V}_j\}$ to meet (9). This is a challenging task since the equations in (9) are nonlinear with respect to $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{V}_j\}$. To tackle this problem, we start with a conventional approach based on the idea of uplink-downlink symmetry.

A. Conventional Approach with Uplink-Downlink Symmetry

Uplink-downlink symmetry has been widely used in precoding design for MIMO multiway relay channels [12], [17], [18], [22]. Particularly, the recent work in [22] used this symmetry to analyze the DoF of the MIMO multipair two-way multi-relay channel. In this subsection, we follow the idea in [22] and describe an uplink-downlink symmetric approach to solving (9). Then, for an arbitrary number of relays, we derive an achievable DoF with respect to $\frac{M}{N}$. We show that there is a significant DoF gap between this result and the DoF upper bound in (5), implying the inadequacy of the precoding design based on uplink-downlink symmetry for multiway multi-relay channels.

To start with, we split each projection matrix $\mathbf{V}_j$ equally into two parts as

$$\mathbf{V}_j = [\mathbf{V}_{j+1,j}, \mathbf{V}_{j-1,j}] \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{V}_{j',j} \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times N}$ is the projection matrix for the message $\mathbf{S}_{j,j'}$. Then the interference neutralization conditions (9a) and (9b) for user 0 can be expanded as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{1,0}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{11a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{2,0}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{11b}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{1,0}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1} = \mathbf{0} \tag{11c}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{2,0}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{11d}$$

Here, "interference neutralization" refers to a special transceiver design strategy for interference cancellation such that a common source of interference from different paths cancels itself at a destination. The interference neutralization conditions for user 1 and user 2 are similar to (11). Thus, for all the 3 users, there are 12 matrix equations for interference neutralization. Moreover, the rank requirements remain the same as (9g)-(9i).

We next establish K achievable DoF points of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, namely, $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d_{\text{sum}}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{3}, 3M\right)$ and $\left(\frac{6k+\sqrt{6k}}{12}, \sqrt{6k}N\right)$, $k = 2, \cdots K$, by following the approach in [18] and [22].

The first DoF point is derived by deactivating $K-1$ of the K relays. In this case, the model reduces to a single-relay MIMO Y channel with the antenna number of the relay equal to N. Then, the precoding design in [18] can be applied directly. From the result of [18], a total DoF of $3M$ can be achieved for single-relay MIMO Y channel with $\frac{M}{N} = \frac{2}{3}$. That is, $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d_{\text{sum}}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{3}, 3M\right)$ is achievable.

We now consider the DoF point $\left(\frac{6K+\sqrt{6K}}{12}, \sqrt{6K}N\right)$. Note that the remaining DoF points can be straghtforwardly obtained by deactivating $K-k$ relays, for $k = 2, \cdots, K-1$. Following [22], we apply signal alignment techniques for the design of $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{V}_{j,j'}\}$ to reduce the number of linearly independent constraints for interference neutralization. First consider the uplink signal alignment design. We align the signals of users j and j' at each relay k by designing $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ to satisfy

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'} = \mathbf{H}_{k,j'}\mathbf{U}_{j',j}, \quad \text{for} \quad j,j' = 0,1,2, \quad j \neq j', \quad \forall k. \tag{12}$$

The alignment (12) implies that $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{k,j'}\mathbf{U}_{j',j}$ span a common subspace, i.e.

$$\text{span}\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\right) = \text{span}\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j'}\mathbf{U}_{j',j}\right). \tag{13}$$

Note that for the single-relay case, it usually suffices to use (13) for signal alignment [18]. However, for the multi-relay case here, we rely on a more strict constraint (12) for signal alignment, so as to reduce the number of linearly independent equations for interference neutralization. We now consider the downlink signal alignment.

From (11), we see that the uplink equivalent channel matrix $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times d}$ is of the same size as the transpose of downlink equivalent channel matrix $\mathbf{V}_{j,j'}\mathbf{G}_{j',k} \in \mathbb{C}^{d\times N}$, for $\forall k, j, j'$. This structural symmetry implies that any beamforming design in the uplink phase can directly carry over to the downlink phase. Specifically, we design the downlink receiving matrices $\{\mathbf{V}_{j,j'}\}$ to satisfy

$$\mathbf{V}_{j,j'}\mathbf{G}_{j',k} = \mathbf{V}_{j',j}\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \quad \text{for} \quad j,j' = 0,1,2, \quad j \neq j', \quad \forall k. \tag{14}$$

From the rank-nullity theorem, to ensure the existence of full-rank $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{V}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (12) and (14), the following conditions must be met:

$$2M - KN \geq d. \tag{15}$$

With (12) and (14), the four interference neutralization conditions of user 0 in (11) reduces to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{1,0}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1} = \mathbf{0} \tag{16a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{2,0}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{16b}$$

Similarly, the linearly independent interference neutralization conditions for users 1 and 2 are given by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{0,1}\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{16c}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{2,1}\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{16d}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{0,2}\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0} = \mathbf{0} \tag{16e}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_{1,2}\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{16f}$$

In the above, (16) is a linear system of $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ with $6d^2$ equations and KN^2 unknown variables. The system (16) has a non-zero solution of $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ provided $d < \frac{\sqrt{6KN}}{6}$. Together with (15), we obtain a DoF point $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d_{\text{sum}}\right) = \left(\frac{6K+\sqrt{6K}}{12}, \sqrt{6KN}\right)$. Note that by deactivating $K-k$ relays, we immediately obtain the remaining the DoF points $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d_{\text{sum}}\right) = \left(\frac{6k+\sqrt{6k}}{12}, \sqrt{6kN}\right)$, for $k = 2, \cdots, K-1$.

We now apply the antenna disablement lemma [15] to the above K DoF points, yielding a continuous DoF curve of uplink-downlink symmetric design for an arbitrary value of $\frac{M}{N}$:

$$d_{\text{sum}} = N \max_{(a,b)\in\mathcal{S}} g_{(a,b)}\left(\frac{M}{N}\right) \tag{17}$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \left\{\left(\frac{2}{3}, 2\right)\right\} \cup \left\{\left(\frac{6k+\sqrt{6k}}{12}, \sqrt{6k}\right) \middle| k = 2, \cdots, K\right\}$ and the g-function is defined as

$$g_{(a,b)}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{b}{ax} & x < a \\ b & x \geq a \end{cases}. \tag{18}$$

It is worth noting that the DoF in (17) is not necessarily achievable, since we still need to check whether the solution of $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ to (16) satisfies the rank requirements (9g)-(9i). In general, the DoF in (17) serves as an upper bound for the uplink-downlink symmetric design described above. In fact, this bound is enough to illustrate the limitation of the uplink-downlink symmetric design. Specifically, we compare the DoF in (17) with the upper bound in (5). We see that for a sufficiently large $\frac{M}{N}$ (say, $\frac{M}{N} \geq \frac{6\sqrt{K}+1}{6}$), d_{sum} in (17) is proportional to $\sqrt{K}$ while d_{sum} in (5) increases linearly with K. This DoF gap implies the inefficiency of the uplink-downlink symmetric design.

B. Main Result

We now propose a new and more efficient approach to the precoding design for the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, so as to achieve a higher DoF than the result in (17). The novelty of our approach is as follows. First, instead of following the conventional uplink-downlink symmetry, our approach performs signal alignment only in the uplink phase. This means that, in the design of user precoding and post-processing, only $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ are used for the purpose of aligning signals to reduce the number of linearly independent equations in (9a)-(9f); the post-processors $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ are used for nulling interference rather than for signal alignment. This introduces additional freedom for system design. Further, to exploit the advantage of this uplink-downlink asymmetric design, we allow a certain number of *receiving* (but not transmitting) antennas at each relay to be deactivated. With this treatment, signal alignment can be performed in a larger range of $\frac{M}{N}$. With the above design of $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$, the problem reduces to the design of the relay precoders $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ that satisfy the linear system in (9a)-(9f) and the rank requirements in (9g)-(9i). We then establish a general method to address this solvability problem. We emphasis that this method can be used to analyze the solvability of any linear system with rank constraints, and so, will find applications to the DoF analysis of many other multiway relay networks.

The main result of this paper is presented below, with the proof given in Section IV.

Theorem 1. *For the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, any total DoF $d_{\text{sum}} < d_{\text{sum}}^*$ is achievable, where*

$$d_{\text{sum}}^* = \min\left\{3M, \max\left\{2M + \frac{10MN}{9M+N}, \sqrt{3K}N\right\}, 2M + \frac{2KN^2}{3M}, 2KN\right\}. \tag{19}$$

Corollary 1. *For $K = 1$, any total DoF $d_{\text{sum}} < d_{\text{sum}}^*$ is achievable, where*

$$d_{\text{sum}}^* = \min\{3M, 2N\}. \tag{20}$$

Proof:: By setting $K = 1$, Corollary 1 follows directly from Theorem 1. ■

For $K \geq 2$, the result in Theorem 1 is given piecewisely in the following corollaries.

Corollary 2. *For $K = 2$ or 3, any total DoF $d_{\rm sum} < d^*_{\rm sum}$ is achievable, where*

$$d^*_{\rm sum} = \begin{cases} 3M & \frac{M}{N} \in [0, 1) \\ 2M + \frac{10MN}{9M+N} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[1, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right) \\ 2M + \frac{2KN^2}{3M} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right) \\ 2KN & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right) \end{cases}. \tag{21}$$

Proof:: By setting $K = 2$ and 3, the result in (21) follows from Theorem 1. ■

Corollary 3. *For $K \geq 4$, any total DoF achievable total DoF $d_{\rm sum} < d^*_{\rm sum}$ is achievable, where*

$$d^*_{\rm sum} = \begin{cases} 3M & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}\right) \\ \min\left\{2M + \frac{10MN}{9M+N}, \sqrt{3K}N\right\} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right) \\ 2M + \frac{2KN^2}{3M} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right) \\ 2KN & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right) \end{cases}. \tag{22}$$

Proof:: By setting $K \geq 4$, the result of (22) follows from Theorem 1. ■

Corollary 4. *For $K \geq 2$, the optimal total DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel is given by*

$$d^{\rm opt}_{\rm sum} = \begin{cases} 3M & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, 1\right\}\right) \\ 2KN & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right) \end{cases}. \tag{23}$$

Proof:: The achievable DoF in Corollary 2 and Corollary 3 coincide with the DoF upper bound in (5) for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, 1\right\}\right] \cup \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right]$. Thus the optimal total DoF is achieved in these ranges. ■

Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 illustrate the total DoF in Corollary 2 ($K = 2, 3$) and Corollary 3 ($K = 5$), respectively, together with the DoF in (17) and the DoF upperbound (5). We see that our approach significantly outperforms the conventional approach based on the uplink-downlink symmetric design. Particularly, as $K \to \infty$, the corresponding gap increases unboundedly. For $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \max\left\{1, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}\right\}\right) \cup \left(\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right)$, the DoF of our approach coincides with the DoF upper bound given in (5), indicating that the optimal DoF of the considered model is achieved. However, for the uplink-downlink symmetric design, the optimal DoF is achieved only for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \frac{2}{3}\right]$, implying that adding additional relay nodes cannot achieve the optimal DoF in a broader range of $\frac{M}{N}$.

We also see that the achievable DoF of the conventional approach fails to achieve the DoF upper bound for large $\frac{M}{N}$, implying that the uplink-downlink symmetric approach can not make full use of all the relay antennas. Moreover, recall that the DoF by the conventional approach is obtained based on K DoF points. Increasing K by one generates one new DoF point while the other DoF points remain unchanged. For example, in Fig. 2, the DoF



Fig. 2. Achievable total DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel for $K = 2$ and 3.

is unchanged for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \frac{6+\sqrt{3}}{6}\right]$ by increasing K from 2 to 3. In general, adding the relays to a system with K relays can not improve the DoF of the conventional approach for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \frac{6(K-1)+\sqrt{6(K-1)}}{12}\right]$.

We now study the asymptotic behavior of the DoF as K goes to infinity. It is readily seen from Corollary 3 that, for any fixed N, the total DoF increases linearly in K. What is more interesting is to understand the asymptotic DoF behavior by fixing the total number of relay antennas, denoted by $N_{\text{total}} = KN$. This limiting process illustrates how the degree of cooperation among relay antennas affects the DoF of the system. We have the following asymptotic bound.

Corollary 5. *For the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel, as $K \to \infty$ with fixed $N_{\text{total}} = KN$, the asymptotic bound of d_{sum} is given by*

$$d_{\text{sum}}^{*} = \begin{cases} 2M & \frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}} \in [0, 1) \\ 2N_{\text{total}} & \frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}} \in [1, \infty) \end{cases}. \tag{24}$$



Fig. 3. Achievable total DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel for $K = 5$.

Proof:: By dividing both sides of (22) by $N_{\text{total}} = KN$, we obtain $\frac{d^*_{\text{sum}}}{N_{\text{total}}}$ with respect to $\frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}}$:

$$\frac{d^*_{\text{sum}}}{N_{\text{total}}} = \begin{cases} \frac{3M}{KN} & \frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}} \in \left[0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3K}\right) \\ \min\left\{\frac{2M}{KN} + \frac{10M}{K(9M+N)}, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{K}\right\} & \frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}} \in \left[\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3K}, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30K}\right) \\ \frac{2M}{KN} + \frac{2N}{3M} & \frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30K}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6K}\right) \\ 2 & \frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}} \in \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right) \end{cases}. \quad (25)$$

Letting $K \to \infty$, we obtain (24). ■

In Fig. 4, we set the total antenna number N_{total} as a constant, and compare the achievable DoF for different values of K. Our target is to see the impact on DoF when a single KN-antenna relay into K relay is split into K relay nodes. Fig. 4 illustrates the DoF results for $K = 1, 2, 5$ and 10, where the case of $N = 1$ is also known as the DoF upper bound in (5). We see that as K increases, the DoF monotonically decreases and approaches the asymptotic bound in Corollary 5.



Fig. 4. The achievable total DoF against $\frac{M}{N_{\text{total}}}$, for $K = 2, 5$ and 10.

Fig. 5 plots the total DoF versus the number of relays for various values of $\frac{M}{N}$. Clearly, d_{sum} cannot exceed $3M$, the case in which all the user antennas are fully utilized. So, it is interesting to explore the number of relay nodes required to achieve $d_{\text{sum}} = 3M$ at a fixed value of $\frac{M}{N}$. From Fig. 5, the minimum number of relays required to achieve $d_{\text{sum}} = 3M$ is $2, 12, 19, 27$ for $\frac{M}{N} = 1, 2, \frac{5}{2}, 3$, respectively. Fig. 5 also shows that, if a small amount of inefficiency can be tolerated in utilizing user antennas, then the required number of relays can be considerably reduced. For example, only 5 relays are required to achieve $d_{\text{sum}} = 7N = \frac{7}{3}M$ for $\frac{M}{N} = 3$, while that number is 27 in achieving $d_{\text{sum}} = 3M$. It is also worth noting that there are transitional flat DoF curves for the cases of $\frac{M}{N} = 2, \frac{5}{2}$ and 3. This flatness corresponds to $d^*_{\text{sum}} = 2M + \frac{10MN}{9M+N}$ (that is independent of K).

IV. Proof of Theorem 1

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1. For $K = 1$, Theorem 1 has been proved in [17]. Thus, it suffices to only consider the case of $K \geq 2$. Based on the linear processing techniques in Section II-B, our goal is



Fig. 5. The achievable total DoF against the number of relays.

to jointly design $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{V}_j\}$ to satisfy the condition (9). We propose two types of signal alignment methods for $\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}$ to generate redundant equations in (9a)-(9f), as detailed below.

A. Signal Alignment I

Signal Alignment I is described as follows. For each $j = 0, 1, 2$, $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}$ are aligned to satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{0,j} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{j,j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{0,j+1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j+1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}, \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \tag{26}$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbf{K}_j \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{j,j+1} \\ \mathbf{U}_{j+1,j} \end{bmatrix}}_{2M \times d} = \mathbf{0} \tag{27a}$$

where

$$\mathbf{K}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{0,j} & -\mathbf{H}_{0,j+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j} & -\mathbf{H}_{K-1,j+1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{KN \times 2M}. \tag{27b}$$

From the rank-nullity theorem, there exist full-rank $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}$ satisfying (27a) with probability one, provided that

$$2M - NK \geq d. \tag{28}$$

With (26), we see that (9a), (9c), (9e) are identical to (9b), (9d), (9f), respectively. Ignoring the redundant equations, we rewrite (9a)-(9f) as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{G}_{0,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{H}_{k,1} \mathbf{U}_{1,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{29a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{G}_{1,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{H}_{k,2} \mathbf{U}_{2,0} = \mathbf{0} \tag{29b}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_2 \mathbf{G}_{2,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{H}_{k,0} \mathbf{U}_{0,1} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{29c}$$

For completeness, we repeat (9g)-(9i) as follows:

$$\mathrm{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{G}_{0,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{W}_{k,0} \right) = 2d \tag{29d}$$

$$\mathrm{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{G}_{1,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{W}_{k,1} \right) = 2d \tag{29e}$$

$$\mathrm{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K=1} \mathbf{V}_2 \mathbf{G}_{2,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{W}_{k,1} \right) = 2d. \tag{29f}$$

What remains is to determine the value of $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d\right)$ to ensure the existence of $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ satisfying (29).

B. Achievable DoF for Signal Alignment I

Based on the proposed signal alignment in (26), for user j, the other interference term in (8) is rewritten as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{j,k} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{H}_{k,j+1} \mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2} \left(\mathbf{S}_{j+1,j+2} + \mathbf{S}_{j+2,j+1} \right) \tag{30}$$

with dimension of d. To neutralize the above interference at every user, we first design $\{\mathbf{F}_j\}$ to partially neutralize the interference in (30), and then design $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ to null the remaining part. Specifically, for $j = 0, 1, 2$, we split the beamforming matrix $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ as

$$\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1} = \left[\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}, \mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)} \right], \tag{31}$$

where $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times d'}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times(d-d')}$ with d' defined as

$$d' = 3d - M. \tag{32}$$

We design $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ to neutralize the interference corresponding to $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)}$ for each user j. That is, $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ need to satisfy

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)} = \mathbf{0} \tag{33a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)} = \mathbf{0} \tag{33b}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{33c}$$

With (33), the received signal at user j in (8) still contains a $2d$-dimensional desired signal and the $(d-d')$-dimensional interference corresponding to $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)}$. With d' in (32), we have $2d + d - d' = M$, implying that the antennas at each user are already fully utilized. Thus, the rank requirements (29d)-(29f) can be alternatively represented as

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = M \tag{34a}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,1}, \mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(R)}\right]\right) = M \tag{34b}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{2,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,2}, \mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(R)}\right]\right) = M. \tag{34c}$$

We design $\mathbf{V}_j$ to null the remaining interference corresponding to $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)}$ for each user. Specifically, we require that $\mathbf{V}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2d\times M}$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{V}_j \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{35}$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2$. Note that the left null space of $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times(d-d')}$ has at least $M-(d-d') = 2d$ dimensions. Therefore, there always exists $\mathbf{V}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2d\times M}$ with full row rank satisfying (35).

We now show that the above $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ satisfy (29). We start with (29a):

$$\mathbf{V}_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2} = \left[\mathbf{V}_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}, \quad \mathbf{V}_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right] \tag{36a}$$

$$= \left[\mathbf{0}, \ \mathbf{V}_0 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{1,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right] \tag{36b}$$

$$= \mathbf{0} \tag{36c}$$

where (36b) and (36c) follow from (33a) and (35), respectively. Similarly, conditions (29b) and (29c) are also satisfied. For (29d), we have

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\mathbf{V}_0\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{W}_{k,0}\right) = \operatorname{rank}\left(\left[\mathbf{V}_0\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{V}_0\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) \tag{37a}$$

$$= \operatorname{rank}\left(\mathbf{V}_0\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = 2d, \tag{37b}$$

where (37a) follows from (35); (37b) is due to the fact that $\operatorname{rank}(\mathbf{V}_0) = 2d$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times M}$ is of full column rank from (34c). Similarly, (9h) and (9i) hold.

Consequently, to prove that a certain point $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d\right)$ is achievable for Signal Alignment I, it suffices to show that the signal alignment condition (28) holds and there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying (33) and (34). We have the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *For* $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right)$ *and* $d < \frac{2M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$*, there exist* $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ *and* $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ *satisfying* (26)*,* (33) *and* (34) *with probability one.*

Proof:: See Appendix I-A. ■

Note that the DoF d in Lemma 1 is not necessarily an integer. A frequently used technique to achieve a rational DoF is symbol extension in which an extended MIMO system is constructed with multiple channel uses. The details can be found in Appendix II.

C. Signal Alignment II

The derivation in the preceding subsection is based on the signal alignment (26). However, this alignment imposes the requirement of (28) that may not always be met. In this subsection, we generalize the signal alignment in (26) by allowing the signal to be aligned in a subspace of the N-dimensional receiving signal space seen at each relay.

Let

$$N' = \frac{2M-d}{K} \tag{38}$$

be the dimension of the subspace for signal alignment. Of course, d should be chosen to ensure $0 \le N' \le N$. Then, each relay deactivates $N - N'$ antennas for signal reception, with the number of active antennas intact for broadcasting. That is, the number of active antennas of each relay is N' in the uplink phase and N in the downlink phase. This implies that the proposed uplink-downlink precoding design is asymmetric in nature.

A convenient way to select a subspace of dimension N' is to deactivate the last $N - N'$ antennas at each relay. Then the precoding matrix of each relay k can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{F}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\mathbf{E}, \quad k = 0, \cdots, K-1 \tag{39}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N'}$ and $\mathbf{E} = \left[\mathbf{I}_{N'}, \mathbf{0}_{N'\times(N-N')}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{N'\times N}$. By the deactivation, the effective channel matrix from user j to relay k is $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{H}_{k,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{N'\times M}$ and the processing matrix of relay k becomes $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k$. As analogous to (26), we aim to design $\mathbf{U}_{j,j'} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times d}$ satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,j} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K-1,j} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{j,j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,j+1} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K-1,j+1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}, \tag{40}$$

or equivalently

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_j \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{j,j+1} \\ \mathbf{U}_{j+1,j} \end{bmatrix}}_{2M\times d} = \mathbf{0} \tag{41a}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,j} & -\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,j+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K-1,j} & -\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K-1,j+1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{KN'\times 2M}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2. \tag{41b}$$

Since $2M - KN' = d$ by the definition of N' in (38), there exist full-rank matrices $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}$ satisfying (40) with probability one.

Similarly to Signal Alignment I, with (39) and (40), (9a)-(9f) reduces to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{G}_{0,k} \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,1} \mathbf{U}_{1,2} = \mathbf{0} \tag{42a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{G}_{1,k} \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,2} \mathbf{U}_{2,0} = \mathbf{0} \tag{42b}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_2 \mathbf{G}_{2,k} \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,0} \mathbf{U}_{0,1} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{42c}$$

and (9g)-(9i) can be rewritten as

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{G}_{0,k} \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,0}\right) = 2d \tag{42d}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{G}_{1,k} \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,1}\right) = 2d \tag{42e}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{V}_2 \mathbf{G}_{2,k} \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,2}\right) = 2d, \tag{42f}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,j} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{W}_{k,j}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2. \tag{43}$$

Then, what remains is to determine $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d\right)$ that ensures the existence of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ satisfying (42).

D. Achievable DoF for Signal Alignment II

We now consider the construction of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k, \mathbf{V}_j\}$ to satisfy (42). Similarly to Signal Alignment I, $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ are designed to neutralize the interference corresponding to $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times d'}$, while $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ are designed to null the remaining interference corresponding to $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times d-d'}$. More specifically, as analogous to (33) and (34), we require $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ to satisfy

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)} = \mathbf{0} \tag{44a}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{1,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)} = \mathbf{0} \tag{44b}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{2,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)} = \mathbf{0} \tag{44c}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{0,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\left[\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,0}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = M \tag{44d}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{1,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\left[\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,1}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(R)}\right]\right) = M \tag{44e}$$

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{2,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\left[\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,2}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(R)}\right]\right) = M. \tag{44f}$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{V}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{2d\times M}$ is of full row rank and satisfies

$$\mathbf{V}_j \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{45}$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2$. It can be readily shown that, with d' in (32) and N' in (38), there always exist $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}$ satisfying (45). Thus, to prove the achievability of a certain DoF point $\left(\frac{M}{N}, d\right)$, it suffices to show that there exist $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ satisfying (44). We have the following result.

Lemma 2. *For* $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[1, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right)$ *and* $d < \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$*, there exist* $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ *and* $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ *satisfying* (40) *and* (44) *with probability one.*

Proof:: See Appendix I-B. ■

E. Achievable DoF with No Signal Alignment

From Lemmas 1 and 2, we see that both Signal Alignment I and II cannot be realized when $\frac{M}{N}$ is relatively small. We next focus on relatively small values of $\frac{M}{N}$ and show that $d_{\text{sum}} = 3M$ (or equivalently, $d = \frac{M}{2}$) is

achievable for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{K}\right)$. To start with, we set

$$\mathbf{V}_j = \mathbf{I}_M \tag{46a}$$

$$\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d \\ \mathbf{0}_d \end{bmatrix} \tag{46b}$$

$$\mathbf{U}_{j,j-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_d \\ \mathbf{I}_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, 1, 2. \tag{46c}$$

Then, (9a)-(9f) reduce to a linear system of $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ with KN^2 unknown variables and $3M^2$ equations. The system allows non-zero solutions of $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ provided $KN^2 > 3M^2$, i.e., $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}\right)$. To prove the achievability of $d = \frac{M}{2}$, it suffices to show that there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying all the conditions in (9). We have the following result.

Lemma 3. *For $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{K}\right)$ and $d = \frac{M}{2}$, there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$, together with $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{V}_j\}$ in* (46)*, satisfying* (9) *with probability one.*

Proof:: See Appendix I-C. ∎

F. Achievable DoF Using Antenna Disablement

In the preceding subsections, we have established an achievable DoF for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}\right) \cup \left[1, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right]$. We now follow the antenna disablement approach [15] to establish achievable DoFs for other ranges of $\frac{M}{N}$. Specifically, for $\frac{M}{N} \in (0, 1)$, we disable $N - M$ antennas at each relay. Then, from Lemma 2, we see that any DoF $d < \frac{3M^2+2MN^*}{9M+N^*} = \frac{M}{2}$ can be achieved, where $N^* = M$ is the number of active antennas at each relay. The only issue is that d^* may be not an integer. This issue can be solved by the technique of symbol extension described in Appendix II. Similarly, with symbol extension and antenna disablement, $d < \frac{KN}{3}$ is achievable for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right)$.

Combining Lemmas 1 and 2, we conclude that any DoF d satisfying $d < d^*$ is achievable, where

$$d^* = \begin{cases} \frac{M}{2} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[0, \max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, 1\right\}\right) \\ \min\left\{\frac{M}{3} + \frac{5MN}{27M+3N}, \frac{\sqrt{3K}N}{6}\right\} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}, 1\right\}, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right) \\ \frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right) \\ \frac{KN}{3} & \frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}, \infty\right) \end{cases}. \tag{47}$$

With $d_{\text{sum}} = 6d$, we immediately obtain (19). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we developed a new formalism to analyze the achievable DoF of the symmetric multi-relay MIMO Y channel. Specifically, we adopted the idea of uplink-downlink asymmetric design and proposed a new approach to

tackle the solvability problem of linear systems with rank constraints. In the proposed design, we also incorporated the techniques of signal alignment, antenna disablement, and symbol extension. An achievable DoF for an arbitrary configuration of (M, N, K) was derived. We believe that the formalism developed in this paper can be used to analyze the DoF of other MIMO mRCs with general user and relay settings, as well as with various data exchange models. This will be an interesting research topic worthy of future endeavor.

APPENDIX I
PROOF OF LEMMAS 1- 3

A. *Proof of Lemma 1*

We first show that the signal alignment (26) can be performed for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right)$ and $d < \frac{2M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$. To see this, we have $\frac{M}{N} \geq \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}$, implying

$$2M - \left(\frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}\right) \geq NK. \tag{48}$$

Further, as $d < \frac{2M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$, we obtain

$$2M - d > 2M - \left(\frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}\right) \geq NK. \tag{49}$$

Therefore, (28) is met, and so there exist $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (26) with probability one.

We next show that $0 \leq d' = 3d - M \leq d$ holds for d chosen sufficiently close to $\frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$. For $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right]$, $d < \frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$ and $K \geq 2$, we obtain

$$d' - d = 2d - M < \frac{2M}{3} + \frac{2KN^2}{9M} - M = \frac{2KN^2 - 3M^2}{9M} < 0, \tag{50}$$

where the last step holds by noting $\frac{M}{N} > \frac{3}{5}K > \frac{\sqrt{2K}}{3}$ for $K \geq 2$. On the other hand, as

$$3 \times \left(\frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}\right) - M = \frac{KN^2}{3M} > 0, \tag{51}$$

we can always choose d close to $\frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$ to ensure $d' = 3d - M > 0$. We henceforth always assume that d is appropriately chosen such that $0 \leq d' \leq d$.

What remains is to show that given $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (26), there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying (33) and (34). To start with, we rewrite (33) using the Kronecker product as

$$\mathbf{K}\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{52}$$

where

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,K-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{3d'M \times KN^2} \tag{53}$$

$$\mathbf{f} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{F}_0) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{F}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{F}_{K-1}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{KN^2 \times 1}. \tag{54}$$

Then, the problem can be recast as finding a solution of (52) satisfying (34). To proceed, we present a useful lemma below.

Lemma 4. *For* $d < \frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$ *and* $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right)$*, assume that there exists a certain choice of* $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ *satisfying*

(a) $\mathrm{rank}\,(\mathbf{K}_j) = KN$ *for* $j = 0, 1, 2$, *where* $\mathbf{K}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{KN \times 2M}$ *is defined in* (27b)*;*

(b) $\mathrm{rank}\,(\mathbf{K}) = 3d'M$*;*

(c) (26)*,* (33) *and* (34) *holds.*

Then for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ *together with full-column-rank* $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ *satisfying* (26)*, there exist* $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ *satisfying* (33) *and* (34) *with probability one.*

Proof:: We show that for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ and full-column-rank $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (26), $\mathbf{K}$ in (53) is of full row rank with probability one. To see this, we first note that $\mathbf{K}$ is a wide matrix since

$$KN^2 - 3d'M = KN^2 + 3M^2 - 9dM > KN^2 + 3M^2 - 9M\left(\frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}\right) = 0. \tag{55}$$

Second, from the channel randomness, we have $\mathrm{rank}\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}^{(L)}\right) = \min\{d', N\} = d'$ and $\mathrm{rank}\,(\mathbf{G}_{j',k}) = \min\{M, N\} = N$. Then $\mathrm{rank}\left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{j',k}\right) = d'N$. Each $d'M \times KN^2$ block row of $\mathbf{K}$ consists of K submatrices in the form of $\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{j',k}$. Therefore, from the channel randomness, the rank of each $d'M \times KN^2$ block row is given by $\min\{d'M, Kd'N\} = d'M$, where the last step utilizes the fact that $\frac{M}{N} \leq \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6} < K$. Further, by noting that the three block rows of $\mathbf{K}$ are statistically independent of each other, we conclude that $\mathbf{K}$ is of full row rank ($= 3d'M$) with probability one.

Using Gaussian elimination, the general solution of (52) can be written as

$$\mathbf{f} = \sum_{a=0}^{A-1} \alpha_a \mathbf{f}_a, \tag{56}$$

where $\{\alpha_a\}$ are free variables and $A = KN^2 - 3d'M$ is the total number of free variables $\{\alpha_a\}$. Note that $\mathbf{f}_a \in \mathbb{C}^{2NN'}$, for $a = 0, \cdots, A-1$, span the right null space of $\mathbf{K}$. Clearly, Gaussian elimination involves the following arithmetic operations: addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. This implies that each element of $\mathbf{f}_a$ is a rational function of $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}^{(L)}\}$. Thus, with proper scaling, we can always express each $\mathbf{f}$ as a finite-degree polynomial with respect to $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}^{(L)}\}$. Following similar arguments, since $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}^{(L)}\}$ are design to satisfy (26) and each $\mathbf{K}_j$ is of full row rank with probability one, matrices $\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}$

can be represented as polynomials with respect to $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \beta_b\}$, where $\beta_0, \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_{B-1}$ are free variables with $B = 2M - KN$.

Now consider the following determinant product:

$$D = \prod_{j=0}^{2} \det\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k \left[\mathbf{W}_{k,j}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)}\right]\right). \tag{57}$$

Note that $D \neq 0$ if and only if the $M \times M$ matrix $\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k \left[\mathbf{W}_{k,j}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(R)}\right]$ is of full rank for $j = 0, 1, 2$, or equivalently, (34) holds. Therefore, to prove Lemma 4, it suffices to show that for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$, there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ given by (56) satisfying $D \neq 0$ with probability one. To this end, we first note that D is a finite-degree polynomial with respect to $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \alpha_a, \beta_b\}$, i.e., D can be represented as

$$D = \sum_{t=1}^{T_{\max}} p_t\left(\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}, \{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}\right) g_t\left(\{\alpha_a\}, \{\beta_b\}\right) \tag{58}$$

where $p_t(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a polynomial of entries of $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$, $g_t(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a monomial of $\{\alpha_a\}$ and $\{\beta_b\}$, and $T_{\max}$ is a finite integer. By assumption, there exist particular $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (a)-(c), implying that there exist particular $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \alpha_a, \beta_b\}$ such that $D \neq 0$. Thus, D is a non-trivial polynomial, i.e., at least one $p_t(\cdot,\cdot)$ is not always zero. Therefore, for randomly generated $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$, D is a non-trivial polynomial of $\{\alpha_a, \beta_b\}$ with probability one. In other words, for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$, we can find $\{\alpha_a, \beta_b\}$ satisfying $D \neq 0$ with probability one. Therefore, there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying (33) and (34) with high probability. ■

We emphasize that the full-rank conditions (a) and (b) in Lemma 4 are indispensable. Too see this, suppose that certain $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfy (a) and (c), but (b) does not hold. Then $\mathbf{K}$ is rank-deficient, and so (56) is no longer a general solution of (52) (since the latter now involves more free variables). Therefore, the subsequent arguments in the proof of Lemma 4 does not hold any more.

To prove Lemma 1, what remains is to show the existence of $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying the conditions (a)-(c) in Lemma 4. To this end, we set $\mathbf{F}_k = \mathbf{I}_N$ for $k = 0, \cdots, K-1$, and choose $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)}\}$ to be random matrices with the elements independently drawn from a continuous distribution. Then, we choose full-rank matrices $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ to satisfy

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{j,0} & \mathbf{G}_{j,1} & \cdots & \mathbf{G}_{j,K-1} \end{bmatrix}}_{M \times KN} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{0,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)} \\ \mathbf{H}_{1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)} \end{bmatrix}}_{KN \times d'} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{59}$$

It can be verified that $KN \geq 3d$ for $d < \frac{M}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M}$ and $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right]$. Then

$$KN - M \geq 3d - M = d', \tag{60}$$

implying that the null space of the $M \times KN$ matrix in (59) has at least d' dimensions. Thus full-rank $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ exist with probability one. For given $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)}\}$, we can determine the values of $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}\}$ (not uniquely). With (26), $\{\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}\}$ are also determined.

We now show that the above constructed $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfy (a)-(c) in Lemma 4 with probability one. From the randomness of $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ and the construction of $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$, it is easy to verify that (a) and (b) hold with probability one. Moreover, since $\mathbf{F}_k = \mathbf{I}_N$, condition (33) is exactly (59). Thus (33) holds. To check (34), we take (34a) as an example. Note that $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\}$ are determined by $\{\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\}$ in (59), respectively. Thus, $\{\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\}$ are not a function of $\{\mathbf{W}_{k,0}\}$. By construction, $\{\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\}$ are independent. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = \min\{M, N\} = N \tag{61}$$

with probability one, where the first equality follows by noting $\mathbf{F}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$, $\mathbf{G}_{0,k} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\times N}$ and $\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times M}$, and the second equality by noting $M > N$ for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right]$. Moreover, as $M < KN$,

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\mathbf{F}_k\left[\mathbf{W}_{k,0}, \mathbf{H}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = \min\{KN, M\} = M \tag{62}$$

with probability one, and so (34a) is met. Following similar arguments, (34b) and (34c) are also satisfied with probability one.

To summarize, the above constructed $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfy conditions (a)-(c) in Lemma 4 with probability one, which concludes the proof of Lemma 1.

B. Proof of Lemma 2

The proof of Lemma 2 closely follows that of Lemma 1. We briefly present the proof in the following.

We first show that the signal alignment in (40) can be performed for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[1, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right)$ and $d < \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$. From the discussion in Section IV-C, it suffices to show that for d close to $\frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$, N' defined in (38) satisfies $0 \le N' \le N$. Too see this, note that

$$N' = \frac{2M-d}{K} = \frac{2M - \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}}{K} = \frac{15M^2}{K(9M+N)} > 0, \tag{63}$$

implying that $N' > 0$ for any $d < \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$. Further, since $1 \le \frac{M}{N} < \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}$, we have

$$\frac{2M - \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}}{K} < N. \tag{64}$$

Therefore, we can always choose d close to $\frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$ to ensure $0 < N' = \frac{2M-d}{K} \le N$. Moreover, following the proof of Lemma 1, we can readily verify that for $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[1, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right)$, if d is chosen sufficiently close to $\frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$, we have $0 \le d' \le d$.

We next show that with $\{\mathbf{U}_{j',j}\}$ satisfying (40), there exist $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ satisfying (44) with probability one. As analogous to Lemma 4, we have the following result. Note that the proof of Lemma 5 follows that of Lemma 4 step by step, and is omitted for brevity.

Lemma 5. *For* $d < \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$ *and* $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[1, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right)$*, assume that there exists a certain choice of* $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ *satisfying*

(a) $\mathrm{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_j) = KN'$ *for* $j = 0, 1, 2,$ *where* $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{KN' \times 2M}$ *is defined in* (41b)*;*

(b) $\mathrm{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{K}}) = 3d'M$*, where*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,0} & \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{1,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,1} & \cdots & \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,K-1} \\ \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{2,0}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,0} & \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{1,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,1} & \cdots & \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,K-1} \\ \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,0} & \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{1,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,1} & \cdots & \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,K-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{3d'M \times KN'N}; \tag{65}$$

(c) (40) *and* (44) *holds.*

Then for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\}$ *together with full column-rank* $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ *satisfying* (40)*, there exist* $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ *satisfying* (44) *with probability one.*

What remains is to show the existence of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}, \mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ satisfying the conditions (a)-(c) in Lemma 5. To this end, we set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{N'} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(N-N')\times N'} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N'} \tag{66}$$

for $k = 0, \cdots, K-1$, and choose $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)}\}$ to be random matrices with the elements independently drawn from a continuous distribution. Then, we choose full-rank matrices $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ to satisfy

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{j,0}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_0 & \mathbf{G}_{j,1}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{G}_{j,K-1}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{K-1} \end{bmatrix}}_{M \times KN'} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{0,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{K-1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)} \end{bmatrix}}_{KN' \times d'} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{67}$$

For $\frac{M}{N} \in \left[1, \frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}\right)$ and $d < \frac{3M^2+2MN}{9M+N}$, we have

$$KN' - M = M - d > d \geq d', \tag{68}$$

implying that the null space of the $M \times KN'$ matrix in (67) has at least d' dimensions. Thus full-rank $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ exist with probability one. For given $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)}\}$, we determine the values of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}\}$ (not uniquely). With (40), $\{\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}\}$ are also determined.

We show that the above constructed $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfy (a)-(c) in Lemma 5 with probability one. Note that by construction of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$, $\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k$ is simply the first N' columns of $\mathbf{G}_{j,k}$, for $j = 0, 1, 2$ and $k = 0, \cdots K-1$. From the randomness of $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\mathbf{F}_k\}$ and the construction of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,j}, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$, we have (a), (b), (40) and (44a)-(44c) hold with probability one. We next take (44d) as an example to check (44d)-(44f). Since $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\}$ are determined by $\{\mathbf{G}_{1,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{G}_{2,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ in (67), respectively, $\{\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ are not a function of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,0}\}$. Moreover, $\{\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\}$ are independent of each other by construction. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\left[\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,0}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = \min\{M, N'\} = N'. \tag{69}$$

As $M < KN' = 2M - d$, we obtain

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\mathbf{G}_{0,k}\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k\left[\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{k,0}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(R)}\right]\right) = \min\{KN', M\} = M \tag{70}$$

with probability one. Thus (44d) holds, and so do (44e) and (44f) by following similar arguments. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.

C. Proof of Lemma 3

Following the arguments in proving Lemma 1 in Appendix I-A, the general solution of (9a)-(9f) with respect to $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ can be represented as finite-degree polynomials of the elements of $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$. Then as analogous to Lemma 4, we have the following result for the solvability of (9). We omit the proof for brevity.

Lemma 6. *For $\frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{K}\right)$ and $d = \frac{M}{2}$, assume that there exists a certain choice of $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ satisfying* (9) *and $\operatorname{rank}(\bar{\mathbf{K}}) = 3M^2$, where*

$$\bar{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{0,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,2}\mathbf{U}_{2,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,2}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{1,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,0}\mathbf{U}_{0,1}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,K-1} \\ \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,0} & \left(\mathbf{H}_{1,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,1} & \cdots & \left(\mathbf{H}_{K,1}\mathbf{U}_{1,0}^{(L)}\right)^T \otimes \mathbf{G}_{2,K-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{3M^2 \times KN^2}. \tag{71}$$

Then for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ together with $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}, \mathbf{V}_j\}$ in (46)*, there exist $\{\mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying* (9) *with probability one.*

What remains is to construct $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ satisfying (9) and $\operatorname{rank}(\bar{\mathbf{K}}) = 3M^2$. We basically follow the construction in the proof of Lemma 1. Let $\mathbf{F}_k = \mathbf{I}_k$, for $k = 0, \cdots, K-1$, and $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ be random matrices with elements independently drawn from a continuous distribution. Then we design $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ with full column rank

satisfying

$$\underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{cccc}\mathbf{G}_{j,0} & \mathbf{G}_{j,1} & \cdots & \mathbf{G}_{j,K-1}\end{array}\right]}_{M\times KN}\underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{cc}\mathbf{H}_{1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2} & \mathbf{H}_{1,j+2}\mathbf{U}_{j+2,j+1}\\ \mathbf{H}_{2,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2} & \mathbf{H}_{2,j+2}\mathbf{U}_{j+2,j+1}\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2} & \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j+2}\mathbf{U}_{j+2,j+1}\end{array}\right]}_{KN\times M}=\mathbf{0},\quad j=0,1,2. \tag{72}$$

From the rank-nullity theorem, there exist full-rank $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (72) with probability one, provided $2M \leq KN$, $\left(\text{which is true for } \frac{M}{N} \in \left(0, \frac{\sqrt{3K}}{3}\right)\right)$. Note that from (46), $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}$ are the left $\frac{M}{2}$ columns and the right $\frac{M}{2}$ columns of $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ for every $j = 0, 1, 2$ and $k = 0, \cdots K-1$. Thus, we can combine them together to form $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ with full column rank. It can be readily verified that, together with $\{\mathbf{V}_j, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ in (46), the above constructed $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ satisfy (9a)-(9f). Moreover, since $\mathbf{G}_{j,k}$ is randomly generated, (9g)-(9i) and $\mathrm{rank}(\bar{\mathbf{K}}) = 3M^2$ are met with probability one, which concludes the proof of Lemma 3.

APPENDIX II
SYMBOL EXTENSION

With the techniques of symbol extension and antenna disablement, we show that all the results in Section IV hold for any rational DoF d. We focus on Signal Alignment I in Section IV-B. The treatments for other signal alignment methods are similar. Let $M^* < M$ satisfying $\frac{M^*}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right)$. Further, assume that both M^* and d are rational numbers satisfying $d < \frac{M^*}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M^*}$. Let L be a positive integer that both LM^* and Ld are integers. Then, we extend the channel by L times and disable $(M - M^*)L$ antennas at each user end. With some abuse of notation, we represent the extended channel of each link in a block-diagonal form as

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,j} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc}\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(0)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(1)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(L)}\end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{LN\times LM^*} \tag{73a}$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{j,k} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc}\mathbf{G}_{j,k}^{(0)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{G}_{j,k}^{(1)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{G}_{j,k}^{(L)}\end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{C}^{LM^*\times LN} \tag{73b}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(l)}$ is the channel from user j to relay k with in the l-th channel use with

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times\lceil M^*\rceil}, \quad \text{for} \quad l=0,\cdots,L\left(M^*-\lfloor M^*\rfloor\right)-1$$
$$\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times\lfloor M^*\rfloor}, \quad \text{for} \quad l=L\left(M^*-\lfloor M^*\rfloor\right),\cdots,L-1$$

and $\mathbf{G}_{j,k}^{(l)}$ is the channel from relay k to user j in the l-th channel use with

$$\mathbf{G}_{j,k}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{C}^{\lceil M^*\rceil\times N}, \quad \text{for} \quad l=0,\cdots,L\left(M^*-\lfloor M^*\rfloor\right)-1$$
$$\mathbf{G}_{j,k}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{C}^{\lfloor M^*\rfloor\times N}, \quad \text{for} \quad l=L\left(M^*-\lfloor M^*\rfloor\right),\cdots,L-1.$$

Our goal is to show that any DoF Ld with $d<\frac{M^*}{3}+\frac{KN^2}{9M^*}$ is achievable for the extended channel, implying that an average DoF d is achieved per channel use. To this end, we need to design $\mathbf{F}_k\in\mathbb{C}^{LN\times LN}$, $\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\in\mathbb{C}^{LM^*\times Ld}$ and $\mathbf{V}_j\in\mathbb{C}^{2Ld\times LM^*}$, for $k=0,\cdots,K-1$ and $j=0,1,2$, to satisfy condition (9) (with the rank $2d$ in (9g)-(9i) replaced by $2Ld$). This can be done by closely following the arguments in Appendix I-A, with the only main difference being that $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ take the block diagonal forms in (73). To proceed, we rephrase Lemma 4 for the extended channel as below.

Lemma 7. *For $d<\frac{M^*}{3}+\frac{KN^2}{9M^*}$ and $\frac{M^*}{N}\in\left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30},\ \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right)$, assume that there exists a certain choice of $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j},\mathbf{G}_{j,k},\mathbf{F}_k,\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

(a) $\mathbf{G}_{j,k}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ are in the form (73)*, for $j=0,1,2$ and $k=0,\cdots K-1$;*

(b) $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{K}_j)=LKN$ for $j=0,1,2$;

(c) $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{K})=3L^2d'M^*$, where $\mathbf{K}\in\mathbb{C}^{3L^2d'M^*\times L^2N^2}$ is defined in (53)*, and $d'=3d-M^*$;*

(d) (26)*,*(33) *and* (34) *hold.*

Then for random $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k},\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ of the form (73)*, there exist $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j'},\mathbf{F}_k\}$ satisfying* (26)*,* (33) *and* (34) *(with the rank M in* (34) *replaced by LM^*) with probability one.*

What remains is to construct $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k},\mathbf{H}_{k,j},\mathbf{F}_k,\mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfying (a)-(d) in Lemma 7. Similarly to Appendix I, we set $\mathbf{F}_k=\mathbf{I}_{LN}$ for $k=0,\cdots,K-1$. Further, we set $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}\}$ to be random block-diagonal matrices of the form (73b) and $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)}\}$ to be random matrices with the elements independently drawn from a continuous distribution. Then, we construct full-rank matrices $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ satisfying

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{G}_{j,0} & \mathbf{G}_{j,1} & \cdots & \mathbf{G}_{j,K-1}\end{bmatrix}}_{LM^*\times LKN}\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{H}_{0,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)}\\ \mathbf{H}_{1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)}\\ \vdots\\ \mathbf{H}_{K-1,j+1}\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j+2}^{(L)}\end{bmatrix}}_{LKN\times Ld'}=\mathbf{0}. \tag{74}$$

By (60) and the arguments therein, we readily see that full-rank $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}\}$ exist with probability one. With the obtained $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(L)}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}^{(R)}\}$, we can determine the values of $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{U}_{j,j+1}\}$, with $\{\mathbf{H}_{k,j}\}$ of the form (73a). With (26), $\{\mathbf{U}_{j+1,j}\}$ are also determined. From the discussions in Appendix I-A, the above constructed $\{\mathbf{G}_{j,k}, \mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{F}_k, \mathbf{U}_{j,j'}\}$ satisfy the conditions (a)-(d) in Lemma 7.

So far, we have shown that with symbol extension and antenna disablement, any rational DoF $d < \frac{M^*}{3} + \frac{KN^2}{9M^*}$ is achievable for $\frac{M^*}{N} \in \left[\frac{9K+\sqrt{81K^2+60K}}{30}, \frac{3K+\sqrt{9K^2-12K}}{6}\right)$. Following similar treatments, we can show that the DoF results in Subsections IV-D and IV-E hold for rational values of d. We omit the details for brevity.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Gastpar and M. Vetterlj, "On the capacity of wireless networks: the relay case," in *Proc. 2002 IEEE INFOCOM*, vol. 3, pp. 1577-1586.

[2] Editors: Y. Hua, D. W. Bliss, S. Gazor, Y. Rong, and Y. Sung, "Theories and methods for advanced wireless relays: Issue I," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 8, Sept. 2012.

[3] S. Zhang, S. Liew, and P. P. Lam, "Hot topic: physical-layer network coding," in *Proc. ACM MobiCom'06*, Los Angeles, USA, Sept. 2006.

[4] D. Gündüz, A. Yener, A. Goldsmith, and H. V. Poor, "The multiway relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 51-63, Jan. 2013.

[5] K. Liu, M. Tao, Z. Xiang, and X. Long, "Generalized signal alignment: on the achievable DoF for multi-user MIMO two-way relay channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 3365-3386, June 2015.

[6] Z. Xiang, M. Tao, J. Mo, and X. Wang, "Degrees of freedom for MIMO two-way X relay channel," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 1711-1720, July 2013.

[7] B. Yuan, X. Liao, F. Gao, and X. Luo, "Achievable degrees of freedom of the four-user MIMO Y channel," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 6-9, Jan. 2014.

[8] R. Wang, X. Yuan, and M. Tao, "Degrees of freedom of MIMO multiway relay channel with clustered pairwise exchange," *IEEE J. Select. Area. Comm.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 337-351, Dec. 2014.

[9] Y. Tian and A. Yener, "Degrees of freedom for the MIMO multi-way relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2495-2511, May 2014.

[10] X. Yuan, "MIMO multiway relaying with clustered full data exchange: Signal space alignment and degrees of freedom," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 6795-6808, May 2015.

[11] X. Yuan, T. Yang, and I. B. Collings, "Multiple-input multiple-output two-way relaying: A space-division approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 6421-6440, Oct. 2013.

[12] C. Wang, "Beyond one-way communication: degrees of freedom of multiway relay MIMO interference networks," submitted to *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Jan. 2014, [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.5582.

[13] A. Chaaban, A. Sezgin, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Approximate sum-capacity of the Y-channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 5723-5740, Sept. 2013.

[14] N. Lee and R. W. Heath, "Degrees of freedom for the two-cell two-hop MIMO interference channel: interference-free relay transmission and spectrally efficient relaying protocol," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5 pp. 2882-2896, May 2013.

[15] S. Chen and R. S. Cheng, "On the achievable degrees of freedom of a K-user MIMO interference channel with a MIMO relay," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 4118-4128, Aug. 2013.

[16] R. Wang and X. Yuan, "MIMO multiway relaying with pairwise data exchange: A degrees of freedom perspective," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, vol. 62, no. 20, pp., 5294-5307, July 2014.

[17] N. Lee, J. B. Lim, and J. Chun, "Degrees of freedom of the MIMO Y channel: Signal space alignment for network coding, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3332-3342, July 2010.

[18] A. Chaaban, K. Ochs, and A. Sezgin, "The degrees of freedom of the MIMO Y-channel," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, Istanbul, Turkey, July 2013.

[19] A. A. Zewail, M. Nafie, Y. Mohasseb, and H. El-Gamal, "Achievable degrees of freedom region of MIMO relay networks using detour schemes," in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*, Sydney, Australia, 2014.

[20] V. R. Cadambe and S. A. Jafar, "Interference alignment and degrees of freedom of the K-user interference channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3425-3441, Aug. 2008.

[21] K. Lee, N. Lee, and I. Lee, "Achievable degrees of freedom on MIMO two-way relay interference channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 1472-1480, April 2013.

[22] R. Wang, X. Yuan, and R. W. Yeung, "Distributed MIMO multiway relaying: Joint signal alignment and interference neutralization," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*, London, England, June 2015.